

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 14-18, 20-23, and 25-30 remain pending in this application. The pending claims stand rejected. Assignee respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10-12, 14-18, 20-23, and 25-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0115448, application of Bouchard (Bouchard) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0065042, application of Picoult, et al. (Picoult), in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0117456, application of Brooks (Brooks), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,937 of Montville (Montville). Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bouchard in view of Picoult, in view of Brooks, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,795,924, application of Kiessling et al. (Kiessling). Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bouchard in view of Picoult, in view of Brooks, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0031320, application of Fan et al. (Fan). Assignee respectfully requests reconsideration.

Claim 1 recites that the second attachment is automatically provided by the server to the mobile device when the secure message previously received at the mobile device is opened in response to a request at the mobile device. In rejecting this subject matter, the examiner cites Montville. It is respectfully submitted that the cited portion of Montville does not teach this claimed feature. The cited portion of Montville reads as follows:

A subscriber can access the server of the messaging service from a personal computer using the Web-based form of service through an S/MIME compliant application to connect between the computer and the server. In a Web-based environment, a digital signature is provided to an authorized recipient, the signature verifying the identity of the sender, the integrity of the message, and the fact of the sending by the sender. The user is given control over whether or not to compress the file size of each outgoing attachment to a message; for subscribers, the decompression of

each compressed attachment happens automatically when a subscriber opens it. Col. 3, line 58 - col. 4, line 2.

To receive e-mail messages from others, User A opens his client-side program on Computer A, or logs into Server I from any other Computer X or Z connected to any Server. He/she downloads the messages to his Computer A, or reads them on-line on the other Computer X or Z. The messages are decrypted automatically, attachments are decompressed automatically if necessary, and other features of the EMC program are implemented for him, since he/she is tied into Server I, which runs the web-side EMC system. Col. 27, lines 12-18.

The cited portion of Montville at most teaches decrypting the messages and decompressing the attachments automatically. However, the cited portion of Montville never discloses the sequence of steps and communications recited in the claim. On the contrary, as shown by the examples in col. 26, line 6 - col. 27, line 19 of Montville, the messages and attachments to the messages are treated as a whole to be either stored on a web server or downloaded to a subscriber's personal computer. In this sense, Montville provides the exact opposite context of claim 1 which recites that the secure message is provided without the second attachment to the mobile device, and the second attachment is then provided to the mobile device, wherein the second attachment is automatically provided by the server to the mobile device when the secure message previously received by the mobile device is opened in response to a request at the mobile device. Because Montville does not teach the claimed feature of claim 1, and the assignee understands that the Examiner would agree that other cited references do not disclose such a feature, claim 1 is allowable and should proceed to issuance. It is respectfully submitted that the §103 rejection against claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claims 26 and 29 recite subject matter analogous to the subject matter of claim 1. Thus, claims 26 and 29 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. In addition, it is noted that the assignee has not provided arguments with respect to certain of the dependent claims in the instant application. This is done

without prejudice to the assignee's right to present arguments regarding any of the dependent claims at any point in the future. Further, because each of the dependent claims in the instant application depends from a base claim that is itself allowable, the dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth with respect to the base claims.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, assignee respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable. Therefore, the examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 16, 2010

By: Matthew W. Johnson

Matthew W. Johnson
Reg. No. 59,108
JONES DAY
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(412) 394-9524